Case 1:11-cr-00897-JFK Document 62 Filed 06/05/13 Page 1 of 18 1

	D5UJARBS	Sentence	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	,	
4	v.		S1 11 Cr. 897 JFK
5	MANSSOR ARBABSIAR, a/k/a "Mansour Arbabsiar	, "	
6	Defendant	•	
7		x	
8			
9			
10			May 30, 2013 11:08 a.m.
11			
12	Deferre		
13	Before:		
14	HON. JOHN F. KEENAN,		
15			District Judge
16			
17	APPEARANCES		
18			
19	PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the		
20	Southern District of New York GLEN KOPP, EDWARD KIM, STEPHEN RICHIN, Assistant United States Attorneys		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
l			

Case 1:11-cr-00897-JFK Document 62 Filed 06/05/13 Page 2 of 18

D5UJARBS Sentence APPEARANCES (Continued) FEDERAL DEFENDERS SERVICES UNIT Attorneys for defendant Arbabsiar BY: SABRINA SHROFF, EDWARD ZAS, Assistant Federal Defenders Also Present: CHRISTOPHER RAIA, Special Agent FBI MARY DELSENER, Paralegal, U.S. Attorney's Office RAPHELLA FRIEDMAN, Paralegal, Federal Defender's Office

1 (In open court) (Case called) 2 3 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. You may be This is in the matter of the United States of America 4 seated. 5 against Manssor Arbabsiar, Indictment No. S1 11 Cr. 897. 6 Ms. Shroff, I address you first. Have you read the 7 probation report? MS. SHROFF: I have, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: Has Mr. Arbabsiar read the report and have 10 you gone over it with him? 11 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, Mr. Arbabsiar and I read the 12 presentence report together, and he has reviewed it as well as 13 the addendum. 14 Do you have any objections to the report? THE COURT: 15 MS. SHROFF: I do not, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. Are you ready for sentence? 17 MS. SHROFF: Mr. Arbabsiar is ready to proceed to 18 sentence. 19 THE COURT: I will hear you on sentence. 20 MS. SHROFF: Thank your Honor. 21 Your Honor, it is not just a hollow acknowledgement or 22 a statement to say here this is one of the most serious crimes 23 that this Court has addressed. I think Mr. Arbabsiar and 24 everyone here is fully aware not just of the results of what

could have happened had this gone through, but there also has

25

been a lot of mention of Mr. Arbabsiar's statements during the

2 time of the offense. There is no taking away from the

seriousness of what Mr. Arbabsiar said and, of course, there is

no taking away from the statements that Mr. Arbabsiar made and

the manner in which he made them.

So the court has focused during the two hearings as it did yesterday about what Mr. Arbabsiar said when asked by the confidential informant whether or not the plot to kidnap, which then transformed into the plot to assassinate, should go forward, and Mr. Arbabsiar acknowledges that that was, indeed, a very serious statement and a very poor statement he made.

In sentencing Mr. Arbabsiar, it would be easy and not terribly difficult to simply focus on that, but 3553 (a), 18 U.S.C. 3553 (a) requires us all to do more. The statute requires us to look at not just the offense and the offense conduct, but also to look at the defendant.

Mr. Arbabsiar is a 58-year-old man. Up to this offense he had absolutely no criminal history that would lead anyone to think that he would participate in this kind of offense conduct. He worked his entire life. He wasn't terribly successful at it, but he worked.

As he says to the court in his letter and as the family members say to the court, Mr. Arbabsiar was a good father and a very good son. He raised his son in a manner that shows clearly that he loves him dearly. He did all that he

could to support his son, and the same holds true for what he did for his mother and his brothers and his sisters.

Each one of these family letters speaks to the kind-hearted person that Mr. Arbabsiar was and is to them. It shows a person who for 58 years of his life did nothing other than what most of us do; have a job, raise his family and try to live a good life.

Mr. Arbabsiar most certainly takes responsibility for his conduct here. He recognizes fully the import of what it is that could have happened, and I think when Mr. Arbabsiar speaks to the court, I hope the court is able to sense his true remorse and his hopes.

The one point the government submission makes, and I would like to address it very briefly before I sit down, is Mr. Arbabsiar's complete cooperation with the United States Attorney's Office and law enforcement after he was stopped at the airport. The government in its submission suggests that Mr. Arbabsiar did not provide to it information that is such that the court should depart from the guideline range.

We most respectfully disagree, and to that end I ask, if I may just hand up to the court, and the government has this, it is the FBI agent's write-up and recollections of the fall 2011 Arbabsiar interview that was provided to Dr. Saathoff, and in that the FBI agent tells Dr. Saathoff, and I quote --

THE COURT: It would have been much nicer if you gave me this before this morning, but go ahead.

MS. SHROFF: You have it, your Honor.

THE COURT: What?

MS. SHROFF: I did give it to the court.

THE COURT: When?

MS. SHROFF: It is in the exhibits that we introduced at the hearing.

THE COURT: Oh, all right, okay. I see. Now I know the document you are referring to. Go ahead.

MS. SHROFF: It says, and I quote --

THE COURT: Since you were handing it up this morning, I thought this was the first I was going to see it. You can give to me again. Go ahead.

MS. SHROFF: It is just two lines, your Honor. It says the FBI agent tells Mr. Dr. Saathoff, "Towards the end we realize we could gain intelligence. We gained a lot of intelligence."

He is talking about the FBI speaking to Mr. Arbabsiar over the period of twelve days after this. I don't think Mr. Arbabsiar nor anyone at this table minimizes any conduct or anything that he did, but we do ask the court, your Honor, to consider all the personal facts that are recited as well as his small step towards trying to make right what he did wrong, and I ask the court to impose a sentence that we requested.

THE COURT: Did you want to hand this up?

MS. SHROFF: Thank you.

THE COURT: Sure.

(Pause)

THE COURT: I have seen this and I have read it before. Thank you. Does anyone wish to speak on behalf of the government?

MR. KOPP: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Kopp.

MR. KOPP: Your Honor, this case is not about just what Arbabsiar said. It is about what he did, what he wanted to have done, the manner in which he wanted it to be done, the people he was doing it with, and the results that would have come from this plot.

The statutory maximum sentence of 25 years imprisonment is the guidelines sentence here and it is the same sentence recommended by the Probation Office. It is the appropriate sentence here for a defendant who worked for over six months to assassinate a foreign diplomat on American soil with the knowledge of the mass carnage that could result. He is no candidate for your Honor's mercy here.

This defendant engaged in a murderous scheme with members of the military of a foreign power hostile to the United States and worked to employ deadly assassins from a Mexican drug cartel to do the dirty-work of another country.

It is an extraordinary crime that requires an equally serious sentence.

The extraordinary nature of this crime is reflected in the Probation Office description of their conclusion as to why 25 years is appropriate here. I am quoting from the PSR:

"The defendant's participation in the instant offense and his disdain for the lives of potential innocent victims is disturbing. While we do not believe any mental health issues led him down this path, his motivation to involve himself in such a horrific crime is unclear. Regardless, it is difficult to consider anything but a lengthy term of imprisonment. For such a significant crime, we believe that this term of incarceration, 25 years, conforms with the purposes set forth in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553 (a)."

Your Honor, the government fully agrees with the sentencing recommendation of the Probation Office. The seriousness of this offense demonstrates the moral bankruptcy of this defendant, and the need for a serious sentence here is the need to send a message of deterrence to anyone who would choose to assist those who want to settle scores with other nations on our soil with resulting deaths of potentially hundreds of people.

Your Honor, I want to just address something that Ms. Shroff mentioned about the defendant's cooperation or assistance to the government they called cooperation. There is

a significant difference between someone who assists after his arrest and makes statements and provides information than someone who decides to cooperate with the government and earn themselves a cooperation agreement and a 5K letter.

This defendant pulled up short. During the course of the phone calls, he decided to stop on his own volition making calls for the FBI. After that he decided not to come in to speak to the government. There is no cooperation agreement here. That limits what the government can do with his information and shows it is not someone who has fully embraced cooperation and what that means, which is an extraordinary show of remorse and a turning of the corner.

So, your Honor, the government does not believe that in light of the seriousness of this offense, the defendant's assistance in providing information after his arrest suffices to earn him any downward variance in this case.

Finally, your Honor, just to address the two days of hearings that we had, the government, based on the evidence there, wants to state that there again the evidence is clear from the hearings that Mr. Arbabsiar was not suffering from a mental disorder that would have impacted or caused his participation in this offense.

Even if he was suffering from hypomania, again the concessions of the defense expert that he could not make a causal link between hypomania and the defendant making

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decisions during the course of those six months makes none of that matter. It should not be significant. It is not significant and should not have any impact on your Honor's decision as to the proper sentence here.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kopp.

Mr. Arbabsiar, please rise, sir. Is there anything you wanted to say because if there is, now is the time to say it and you may tell me anything you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: I have one thing to read.

THE COURT: You can read it and speak loud enough and read slowly so the Court Reporter can hear it.

THE DEFENDANT: Not much, just a little bit.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: I said it and she wrote it down for me.

THE COURT: You know what you want to tell me.

THE DEFENDANT: I want to say thank you for being patient with me. I have respect for you, Judge. Whatever I did wrong, I take responsibility for it. I can't change what I did. I have a good heart. I never hurt anyone anybody, anyone. My mind sometimes is not in a good place. It runs ahead of my -- it goes faster than myself. I was also good to my son and a good son to my mother. I know that you have to punish me for the things I did wrong. I respect that, and hopefully one day I can go home and see my son and my family.

THE COURT: Anything else, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: That is it. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Stay standing, sir, please.

I have read the probation report, dated April 19th, 2013, and the defense submissions which I received on May 1st and May 3rd, 2013, including the exhibits thereto and the several letters submitted on behalf of the defendant. I have also read the sentence memorandum of the government, dated May 2, 2013.

Before me is a 58-year-old defendant who pleaded guilty pursuant to a plea agreement. The plea was was on October 18th, 2012. The Probation Department recommends a sentence totaling 25 years and finds that the total offense level was calculated to be 46, that because of Note 2 to Chapter 5, Part A, of the sentencing guidelines, and I am quoting from the guidelines now, "an offense level of more than 43 is to be treated as an offense of 43."

That is the end of the quote. The criminal history category is Roman VI, as set forth in Paragraph 50 of the presentence report, not Roman I, as it is erroneously at Page 26 of the report. If you look at Page 26 of the report, it says Criminal History Category Roman I. It should be VI. I find the total offense level is 43 and that the criminal history category, pursuant to Section 3A1.4 of the sentencing guidelines is Roman VI.

I recognize full well the guidelines call for a sentence range of 25 years and are merely advisory and are not binding upon me. I have considered the factors set forth in Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553 (a). I have considered the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant. I have thought about the kinds of sentences available and I have considered the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities amongst defendants.

I am imposing a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of sentencing, which are, of course, to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

This 58-year-old defendant is a native of Iran, who is a naturalized American citizen. He conspired with members of the Islamic Republic Guard Corps. to assassinate the Ambassador from Saudi Arabia to the United States in Washington, D.C. He fully realized that this act would likely result in mass casualties. He arranged for two wire transfers in August of 2011 to be sent through Manhattan to an undercover FBI bank

account. The wire transfers amounted to a total just under a hundred thousand dollars, of \$99,920. This amount was to be the down payment for the murder of the Ambassador in a restaurant in Washington, D.C., our nation's capital. When told that there would likely be from "100 to 150 people in the restaurant," including United States Senators, he respond this

was "no problem" or "no big deal."

The plot was hatched in Iran, and a member of the Islamic Republic Guard Corps., known as the Qods Force, was among the co-conspirators. Thanks to excellent work by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the defendant was arrested and acknowledged his role in the plot and described the involvement of his Iranian co-conspirators.

The defendant was himself to benefit financially from his involvement in the plot. An extensive Fatico hearing was conducted before me on May 8, 2013 and yesterday, May 29th, 2013. Dr. Michael First, a Professor of Clinical Psychiatry at Columbia University, testified for the defense, and Dr. Elissa Miller, the Chief Psychologist at the Metropolitan Correctional Center, and Dr. Gregory Saathoff, a psychiatrist, testified for the government.

Dr. First believed that the defendant's mental condition was Bipolar II and he was suffering from a hypomanic episode during the conspiracy. Drs. Miller and Saathoff dispute this and maintain that he is not suffering from a

bipolar disorder. The defense seeks a sentence of 10 years, and the government seeks a 25-year sentence as recommended by the Probation Department.

Drs. First, Miller and Saathoff are all qualified in their areas of expertise, but the court concludes that Dr. Saathoff was more convincing than Dr. First. Dr. Saathoff spent 32 to 33 hours interviewing Mr. Arbabsiar, while Dr. First's interviews took a total of 24 hours, as to the testimony at the hearing.

Moreover, Dr. First acknowledged that recorded conversations between Mr. Arbabsiar and a confidential informant did not indicate that hypomanic episode persisted continuously throughout the life of the conspiracy. The court observes that the defense diagnose of the defendant has switched over time. Originally in the July 13th, 2012 report, Dr. First described the defendant as being manic and classified him as bipolar without specifying him as Bipolar I or Bipolar II. Now in his April 16th, 2013 report, Dr. First described the defendant as being Bipolar II and having undergone hypomanic symptoms. Dr. First has concluded that the defendant is mentally competent to stand trial and that he knows right from wrong.

Nothing in the record before me warrants a sentence of less than 25 years. In a case like this, deterrence is of supreme importance. Others who may have financial or political

purposes in engaging in acts of violence against the United

States or its interests must learn the lesson that such conduct
will not be tolerated. The fact that the defendant's age was

58 when he was first questioned and he began to cooperate which
he abruptly ceased doing is not of moment.

It is adjudged on Count 1, the defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States or his authorized representative for a term of 10 years, which is 120 months.

On Count 2, the defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States or his authorized representative for a term of 10 years, which is 120 months.

On Count 3, the defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States or his authority representative for a term of 60 months, which is five years.

The sentences of incarceration are all to run consecutively and not concurrently. Thus, the total sentence is 300 months, which is 25 years. While incarcerated, the defendant is to receive the appropriate medical treatment for his high blood pressure and any other medical problems.

At the expiration of the term of incarceration, the defendant is to serve a period of three years supervised release on each count. The periods of supervised release are to run concurrently and not consecutively under the standard and mandatory conditions of supervised release.

As a special condition of supervised release, the defendant is to participate in any mental health program suggested or approved by the Probation Department. The defendant is to continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by the health care provider. He is to contribute to the costs of services rendered not covered by third-party payment if he has the ability to pay. I authorize the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports to the health care provider.

The defendant is to submit his person, his residence, his place of business, his vehicle or any other premises under his control to search on the basis Probation has reasonable belief that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of release may be found. Any search is to be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable fashion. Failure to submit to search may be grounds for revocation. The defendant is to inform any other residents that the premise may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

The defendant is to report to the nearest Probation

Office within 72 hours of his release from custody. Three

\$100.00 special assessments are ordered as required by law, for
a total special assessment of \$300.00. I am not fixing a fine
because the defendant does not have the wherewithal to pay a

fine.

Addressing Mr. Kopp, is there any forfeiture order

here?

MR. KOPP: Yes, the government has provided you with a consent forfeiture order signed by the parties.

THE COURT: Thank you. I have signed the forfeiture order. Copies should be provided to Ms. Shroff, to the Government and to the defendant himself. Both sides are advised of their right to appeal since this is a sentence under the sentencing guidelines.

That is the sentence of the court.

MR. KOPP: Your Honor, just one thing. The government respectfully requests the underlying counts against the defendant be dismissed.

THE COURT: Your application is granted.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, on behalf of Mr. Arbabsiar, may I request that the court recommend that he receive treatment while incarcerated in the Bureau of Prisons and --

THE COURT: I said I want him to receive medical treatment.

MS. SHROFF: Thank your Honor.

THE COURT: There is no question that will be in the judgment, and I said that when I set the sentence.

MS. SHROFF: May I ask the court to recommend he be designated as close to the State of Texas as possible?

THE COURT: I am not going to get involved in that in this case because of the nature of the crime. I am going to

Case 1:11-cr-00897-JFK Document 62 Filed 06/05/13 Page 18 of 18 D5UJARBS Sentence

leave that up to the Bureau of Prisons. I certainly have no objection if he is institutionalized in the State of Texas or near the State of Texas, that is fine with me, but I am not going to start telling the Bureau of Prisons where to place this defendant. Thank you. MS. SHROFF: Thank your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, Marshals. (Court adjourned)